DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 262 EC 162 166

AUTHOR	Grosenick, Judith K.; Huntze, Sharon L.
TITLE	Behaviorally Impaired Children in Nebraska. Training Needs Analysis. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Nebraska Univ., Lincoln. Dept. of Special Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Nebraska State Dept. of Education, Lincoln. Special Education Section.
PUB DATE	Jun 82
NOTE	72p.; For administrators' perceptions of training needs, see EC 162 167. For other related documents, see EC 162 159-165 and EC 162 168.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavior Disorders; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Needs Assessment; *Resource Teachers; State Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Nebraska

ABSTRACT

The report summarizes a needs assessment in the area of inservice training for teachers of behaviorally impaired students in Nebraska. Procedures for conducting the needs assessment are described in terms of three functions: planning (involving collaboration of a number of agencies), data collection (a Professional Development Needs Survey was designed and administered to classroom and resource teachers), and data analysis. Section one of the survey addressed content or skill areas that may be considered as topics for inservice efforts. Ss ranked curriculum content/materials in social skills/affective education as the top priority. Ss were also asked to indicate the amount of assistance they preferred and other persons they felt might benefit from inservice on that topic. In the second section, Ss ranked possible formats in terms of desirability and effectiveness (top choices for both questions were "hands on" experiences, salary credit, and college credit). In the final section, Ss revealed demographic data as well as information about inservice presentations, professional growth, support, and sources of frustrations. The study concludes with a list of recommendations for content priorities, amount of assistance, audience, and format. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith K. Grosnick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL REPORT

BEHAVIORALLY IMPAIRED CHILDREN IN NEBRASKA

TRAINING NEEDS ANALYSIS

Developed By: Judith K. Grosenick
Sharon L. Huntze

June 1982
National Needs Analysis Project in Behavior Disorders
Department of Special Education
University of Missouri-Columbia
Columbia, Missouri

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The activity which is the subject of this report was made possible because of support from several sources including: (a) the project on National Needs Analysis in Behavior Disorders, Grant No. G008101817 (Project No. 029CH10505) from the Division of Personnel Preparation; Special Education Programs; U.S. Department of Education; (b) the Support System Project for Behaviorally Impaired, University of Nebraska-Lincoln; and (c) the Special Education Branch of the Nebraska Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the opinion or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln or the Nebraska Department of Education. No official endorsement by these agencies should be inferred.

The fulfillment of an activity such as this requires the time, effort, and expertise of numerous individuals. Appreciation is extended to the following individuals whose input significantly shaped the form of this document: Ms. Adria Bace, Dr. Howard Halpern, Ms. Pam Hughes, Ms. Mary Ann Losh, Dr. Reece Peterson, Mr. Jon Rosell, Mrs. Barbara Ross, Mr. Richard Wehland, and Mr. Stanley Wilke.

Judith K. Grosenick, Professor
and Project Director

Sharon L. Huntze
Assistant Professor

Project on National Needs Analysis
in Behavior Disorders
Department of Special Education
College of Education
University of Missouri-Columbia
Columbia, Missouri 65211

Preface

The project on National Needs Analysis in Behavior Disorders began its work in 1979 by collecting, reviewing, synthesizing, and disseminating information on the "state of the art" relative to services for behavior disordered children and youth. In particular, the project focused on severe behavior disorders, adolescent behavior disorders, and human resource issues in behavior disorders. Those findings were published in a series of documents: one document on each of the three topics; an introductory document outlining the needs analysis model; and a symposium proceedings on the topic of leadership training in the area of behavior disorders.

As of September, 1981, the project began broadening its emphasis by applying the results of its previous work to inservice training for leadership personnel in the area of behavior disorders. As part of that effort, the project is providing technical assistance to a limited number of states including Nebraska, relative to improving services to behavior disordered children and youth. Particular emphasis of these various assistance activities is upon inservice and interagency collaboration. This final report is the result of one such effort by the National Needs Analysis Project. Its emphasis is clearly upon inservice and its development, implementation, and support has truly been a collaborative effort.

One final note of explanation is in order. While the National Needs Analysis Project has used the term "behavior disorders" throughout its previous activities and publications (the rationale for which has been thoroughly discussed in those publications), this report utilizes the term behaviorally impaired in certain places. This does not represent a change in project philosophy. Rather, since behaviorally impaired is the legal terminology of the state of Nebraska and because the document is intended for use in that state, its usuage seems most appropriate.

FINAL REPORT

NEBRASKA TRAINING NEEDS ANALYSIS FOR BEHAVIORALLY IMPAIRED

INTRODUCTION

Background

The passage of Public Law 94-142 has, among its numerous effects, heightened professional awareness and concern regarding a variety of special education issues including services to handicapped children, quality and supply of service provider and pre-service and inservice training. One of the specific provisions of the Act which has received increasing attention since its implementation is that one which relates to the development and implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development (CSPD). According to the regulations of Public Law 94-142, each state education agency (SEA) is required to develop a comprehensive system of personnel development which includes participatory planning, needs assessment, in-service and pre-service training, dissemination and adoption of promising practices, evaluation, and technical assistance. The premise underlying these requirements is that the quality of services for handicapped children is dependent upon the competency of those who administer and provide such service. As a result of the CSPD requirements, SEAs as well as many colleges and universities, either individually or collaboratively, have become involved in various aspects of personnel planning and development. Such efforts have at least begun to address an area of need which has elicited much concern historically but which, until the passage of Public Law 94-142, has received little qualitative attention.

The need for greater effort (both quantitative and qualitative) in the area of personnel development was one of several major findings which

emerged from the early work of the National Needs Analysis Project in Behavior Disorders. Because those results are relevant to the activity, findings and recommendations reflected in this report, it seems appropriate to present the project's results, at least briefly, herein. Therefore, what follows is a summary of the data and the interpretation thereof regarding several parameters of one mechanism of personnel development, i.e., inservice training, as encountered by the National Needs Analysis Project. Greater detail on the specific results related to personnel development in behavior disorders (both pre-service and inservice) can be found in the project previous publications (Grosenick and Huntze, 1980a; Grosenick and Huntze, 1980b; Huntze and Grosenick, 1980).

In an attempt to attack the problems of staggering numbers of unserved children and almost equally shattering teacher shortages besetting the field of behavior disorders, local and state education agencies and institutions of higher education have turned to one particular avenue for personnel development, inservice training. Interestingly, it is this very effort--inservice training--that has come under some of the most severe criticism of all in the field of behavior disorders. By far the largest amount of inservice, i.e., retraining and/or additional training of currently employed staff, is conducted by public school districts. Examination of States' Annual Program Plans submitted under Public Law 94-142 reveals that most inservice relative to behavior disorders falls into these categories: behavior management, behavior modification, mainstreaming behavior disordered students, and identification of behavior disordered students. The concern here is not that such inservice is inappropriate, but rather that it is embryonic. In a time when the field is unable to provide enough adequately trained teachers for even 1/4-1/3 of all behavior disordered children and youth, such effort is obviously insufficient.

In institutional settings, very little inservice is offered specific to the educational needs of behavior disordered students. Mental health facilities offer inservice oriented to a range of medical, psychiatric, and related therapies. Also, they may provide some inservice on behavior management or behavior modification. Seemingly lacking are such inservice topics as classroom practice, public school reintegration, etc., for behavior disordered children and youth.

Much the same holds true for other state operated/state supported facilities. Since the populations in these institutions are not synonymous with behavior disorders (as in mental health facilities), but rather only some children and youth in facilities for neglected or delinquent are considered behavior disordered, there is even less relationship between inservice topics and the subject of behavior disorders.

Typical practice within mental health and youth services is to provide only one or two days a year for inservice activities. A few institutions allow some release time for staff to attend additional training "off campus." Most do not. A few institutions grant salary credit for accumulated inservice and/or financial assistance to teachers upgrading their certification. Most do not.

In general, very little inservice is conducted in such institutions and less is directed toward behavior disordered children and youth. Particularly in light of the temporary certification problems in many of these institutions, the lack of inservice is disconcerting.

While the above information about inservice reflects the current general practice, a more serious, underlying concern is expressed in various ways by most state and local education agency personnel. The concern is for the basic conceptualization of what inservice is, what it should do, and how it should proceed.

There is universal disenchantment with the historically used "one person, two hour spiel" on a currently popular "topic" in the area. This sort of "inservice" has a place. Basically, it is a consciousness-raising technique and as such is an initial step in most learning processes. The problem lies in the fact that most schools and institutions seek inservice as a way to upgrade the skills of their staff; that is, they are looking for behavior change in their staff. They perceive, accurately, that this sort of "inservice" does not effect that change. When such change does not occur, they then feel that they have wasted time and money on "inservice." Persons who have provided this type of inservice are equally upset since the implication is that they "weren't good enough" or "didn't do their job well." In fact, many such inservice providers now refuse to be involved in such sessions due to the growing, and somewhat unfair, criticism of that work.

All this points to a serious need on the part of the providers and recipients of inservice to re-think the process. If the goal of behavior change is a valid one, and most would agree that it is, then it is necessary to incorporate what we know about learning processes into the inservice concept. Recipients of inservice can not expect to get large scale behavior change from one, two or three two-hour sessions per year. Providers can not expect to accomplish that. Instead, inservice must be reconceptualized as an integrated, ongoing process which requires a time and money commitment on the part of recipients.

The crimes of poorly conceived inservice are: (1) that it wastes huge amounts of state and local education agencies' monetary assets and (2) it gives the generic concept of inservice an unjustified "bad name." On the other hand, inservice is a valuable tool. Particularly in an area like behavior disorders where shortages of teachers abound, it is an excellent

means for updating and/or converting current, experienced staff to providing services to behavior disordered children and youth.

It was a concern for providing quality inservice in an area desperately in need of such activity coupled with the desire to forge ahead in the implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development within the state of Nebraska which served as the stimulus for the activity which is the subject of this report. The "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired" project is an attempt, albeit on a small scale, to approach the provision of inservice in a systematic manner by providing decision-makers with a database upon which to fashion inservice priorities and directions. In addition, it is hoped that the experience gleaned as a result of implementing this process within one specific area of handicapping condition will prove helpful to other professionals as they contemplate use of similiar activities within other areas of handicapping conditions and/or with different target populations.

Purpose

As indicated previously, the activities comprising the "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired" project focused upon a systematic approach to inservice needs assessment in the area of behaviorally impaired (BI) in the state of Nebraska. This report, which summarizes the details of this effort, has as its specific purposes to:

1. Describe the procedures employed in the design and implementation of a statewide inservice needs assessment in the area of behaviorally impaired;
2. Present the data and accompanying analysis which constitute the results of the aforementioned needs assessment;
3. Offer a series of recommendations relative to future directions of inservice in BI in the state of Nebraska drawn from the results of the needs assessment; and

4. Set forth some suggestions relative to the needs assessment process as a guide to others implementing similar activities in the future.

Audience

Given the nature of the activities described and the purposes of this report, it is expected that the information presented herein will have most relevence for professionals in the Nebraska Department of Education and other state agencies which provide services to BI children and youth as a guide in the design of future efforts in inservice training. For that same reason, it should also be of value to teacher training personnel at institutions of higher education and other inservice providers responsible for faculty/staff development. In addition, other professionals including administrators, teachers, and support staff who may have input into the nature of inservice within their school building, district or educational unit may also be interested in the report's results.

PROCEDURES

The activities comprising the "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired" project spanned approximately nine months time from planning through completion of the final report. For purposes of this report these activities have been organized by function, e.g., planning, data collection, data analysis, etc. This organization, of course, also reflects the temporal sequence in which the activities were implemented.

Planning

As indicated in the Preface, the development and implementation of the "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired" project represented a collaborative effort involving the National Needs Analysis Project, University of Missouri-Columbia; the Support System Project for Behaviorally Impaired, University of Nebraska-Lincoln; and the Special Education Branch, Nebraska Department of Education. The rationale behind each group's participation was quite clear. The National Needs Analysis Project has as its major thrust the provision of inservice to leadership personnel in the area of behavior disorders. Part of that directive is a commitment to provide technical assistance in the area of behavior disorders to a limited number of states including Nebraska. Given that role description and the project's earlier investigation of the state-of-art relative to inservice in behavior disorders, the National Needs Analysis Project appeared a logical resource (as well as an interested party) to be utilized in the implementation of a statewide inservice needs assessment BI.

On the other hand, the Support System Project for Behaviorally Impaired, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, has, since its inception, been actively involved in providing resource information, inservice and assistance

to professionals in the field of BI throughout Nebraska. The concept of participating in a statewide inservice needs assessment in BI fell well within that project's parameters.

Finally, the Special Education Branch, Nebraska Department of Education functions under a mandate as well as a commitment to develop and implement a comprehensive system of personnel development within its state. Its interest in the inservice needs assessment project rested in (a) the data which when analyzed could serve as a basis for decision-making relative to inservice directions, as well as (b) the process which might ultimately serve as a stimulus for other projects developed under the aegis of CSPD.

The vehicle utilized to design and implement the activities comprising the "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired" project was a cadre of eleven professionals including two public school teachers of the behaviorally impaired, one representative each from an intermediate education unit, mental health, and corrections as well as individuals affiliated with the National Needs Analysis Project, the Support System Project for the Behaviorally Impaired and the Nebraska Department of Education. This group was convened in October, 1981, with the expressed purpose of detailing the overall nature and sequence of activities encompassing a statewide inservice needs assessment in BI. Specific objectives of this meeting included determining: (a) the general content and structure of the needs assessment survey instrument (b) the target population to be surveyed, (c) the timelines for the data collection and analysis phases, and (d) the roles and responsibilities of the planning committee members in relation to the various needs assessment activities.

Data Collection

Instrumentation. Using the information presented at the fall planning meeting, a subcommittee of the whole devised the specific instrument to be employed in the survey of inservice needs in BI in Nebraska. The final instrument, Professional Development Needs Survey for Serving Behaviorally Impaired Students, was four pages in length and was divided into three major subcomponents. (Please see Appendix A for a copy of the needs assessment survey.)

In the first section, the intent was to elicit information related to inservice topics. To that end, the survey probed perceptions of three factors: (a) the respondents' rating of need for inservice on a specific topic, (b) their preferences in terms of amount of inservice needed in relation to a specific topic, and (c) other personnel who might also benefit from inservice on a specific topic. Needs assessment instruments routinely tap respondents' preferences and perceptions of need in relation to inservice topics. In that respect this instrument was no different. However, it was felt that information on the amount of assistance desired and others who could also benefit from assistance would be helpful in the decision-making process in terms of the determination of the appropriate intensity of inservice as well as the identification of target populations in need of inservice.

In gathering the information relative to the content of inservice, respondents were provided with a list of 30 topics. These topics included 24 knowledge-based areas such as identification, IEPs, social studies content/materials, mainstreaming, discipline, individual counseling, etc., and eight areas which were more personal in orientation, e.g., coping with stress, creativity, assertiveness, using humor, etc. These latter areas were chosen for inclusion because persons felt they were important contributors to successful professional functioning in the area of BI, but also represented topics

frequently overlooked or underplayed in more traditional needs assessment surveys.

To assess need for inservice, respondents were asked to rate each of the 30 topics on a five point scale (1 = low priority, 5 = highest). Preferences regarding the amount of assistance were ascertained by providing respondents with five options ranging from "one time contact with assistance" to "several contacts over one to two months" through "multiple contacts over more than one year." For each of the 30 inservice topics, respondents selected the one option which characterized the amount of assistance which would be most beneficial to them. Finally, using the same list of inservice topics, respondents were asked to indicate one other person (from a list of nine) who might also benefit from assistance in that area. Others whom they might select included: other special education teachers, principals, supervisors, support staff, regular class teachers, aides, etc.

The second major subcomponent of the needs assessment instrument focused upon potential format for the delivery of inservice. Again, this is a variable which has historically received less attention in the assessment of inservice needs. Two types of information relative to inservice format were investigated: desirability and effectiveness. In both instances, respondents were provided with a list of 25 different formats for inservice to which to respond. These formats included options such as observations of other teachers, conferences and workshops, retreats, permanent floating substitutes, short-term sabbaticals, summer seminars, etc. While any such list will never be all inclusive, it was felt that the options presented went beyond the more commonly utilized formats and provided respondents with sufficient, albiet not unlimited, diversity. Given the list of 25 formats, respondents were asked to rate each format on a five point scale (1 = lowest, 5 = highest), first in terms

of desirability as an inservice format and then with regard to effectiveness as an inservice format.

The third and final subcomponent of the survey encompassed a potpourri of demographic data and open ended questions. These were posed in relation to satisfaction/dissatisfaction, with previous inservice and current employment, as well as discriptions of personal plans for professional growth and factors which facilitated or hindered their recent professional growth.

Target Population. Initial plans called for the survey to be distributed statewide to three separate target populations including: (a) BI teachers, (b) resource teachers, and (c) special education directors and building principals. Limited resources, however, precluded the inclusion of the latter group as a distinct target population. Therefore, the needs assessment survey was eventually mailed to two seperate sets of respondents. One population, designated as BI teachers, included all currently employed teachers of self contained BI classrooms, either publicly or privately based. The second target population, labeled resource teachers, was composed of all currently employed teachers of resource rooms (public or private) in which BI children or youth were enrolled. The actual mailing list for these two populations was developed through the combined efforts of the Support System Project for Behaviorally Impaired and the Special Education Branch, Nebraska Department of Education.

Timelines. The final draft of the needs assessment survey was completed in January, 1982. Distribution to the target populations including follow-up letters, occurred during the months of February and March. Data collection was terminated as of mid-April.

Data Analysis

A total of 500 surveys were distributed to BI and resource teachers throughout Nebraska. Of this, 204 (41%) were returned. Given that the survey was mailed to the entire population as defined, the return rate was well beyond that level necessary for it to be considered statistically valid.

Analysis of the demographic data relative to the target population indicates that an equal percentage (38%) of BI teachers and resource teachers responded. An additional 21% identified themselves as principals, special education directors or other BI related professionals. The remaining 3% did not respond to any of these role descriptors. It is important to note that respondents selected the descriptor (teacher of BI, other special education teacher, principal, director of special education, other) which they felt best characterized their role. Thus, while principals and special education directors were not idenfied as a separate entity within the target population to be queried, the final analysis indicated that a sizeable segment of the respondents viewed themselves in such roles.

As previously indicated, the target population surveyed included professionals based in both public and private facilities. Examination of the types of agencies in which the respondents are employed reveals that by far the largest percentage of respondents are public school based: BI Teachers-62%, Resource Teachers-99%, and All Respondents-74%. The remaining percentages of respondents in the "BI Teacher" and "All Respondents categories are quite evenly distributed across other public agencies, private agencies, and other service delivery environments.

In order to gain a clearer picture of the respondents' background, the survey included a request for information regarding endorsement in behaviorally impaired and length of employment in BI positions. As indicated

in Figure 1, a significant percentage (82%) of the resource teachers do not hold BI endorsement. This is not particularly startling since resource teachers may hold endorsement in another area of handicapping condition regardless of whether or not there are BI children enrolled in their classrooms. What is more surprising and disconcerting is that 50% of the BI teachers are not endorsed in the area in which they are currently teaching.

Figure 1

Percentage of Respondents by Type of Endorsement

	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
BI Endorsement	25	40	10
Provisional BI Endorsement	9	10	8
Not Endorsed	64	50	82

Length of BI related employment is depicted in Figure 2. While the percentages of respondents employed in BI for periods of one, two, or three years are somewhat equal, a significant proporation of the respondents in all categories have been employed in BI for four years or more. This longer employment record is worth noting in light of the current concern regarding attrition and burnout and the frequently quoted figure of an average length of employment in BI of three years. One also wonders if it is possible that teachers employed in the field of BI for longer periods of time are more highly motivated to complete and return surveys.

These data have been presented at this point in time in order to "set the scene" for the remaining data, as a means of assisting the reader in sensing the respondents' frame of reference. The subsequent

Figure 2

Percentage of Respondents by Length of BI Related Employment

	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
Less than 1 year	14	18	13
Current Year + One Year	11	6	13
Current Year + Two Years	13	13	18
Current Year + Three Years	12	13	14
Current Year + Four Years	48	47	40
No Response	3	4	3

section, Survey Results and Analysis, describes in detail the specific data, their analysis and accompanying interpretation. The vast majority of data (except open ended questions) were computer analyzed in terms of standard measures of central tendency, and frequency and percentage distributions.

SURVEY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The Professional Development Needs Survey for Serving Behaviorally Impaired Students was composed of three major sections. Section I was concerned with content and/or skill areas that might be considered as topics for inservice efforts. Respondents were asked to provide three types of data relative to these content/skill areas: (1) the need they felt for assistance in this area; (2) the amount of assistance they preferred; and (3) other persons whom they felt might also benefit from inservice on that topic. Section II concerned the manner in which inservice can be made available. Respondents were asked to rate both the desirability and effectiveness of a range of inservice formats. Finally, Section III tapped a variety of demographic data including: job description, job placement, certification, years of service in BI, previous inservice involvement, etc. This section also allowed for some "open ended" responses concerning job enjoyment and stress. The survey is reproduced in its entirety in Appendix A. The data from each of the sections listed above will be presented with an accompanying analysis of the data.

It was determined to compare the means of the total population of respondents against two subgroups of respondents: all BI teachers and all resource teachers. These two subgroups accounted for 76% of the total responses, and therefore, do not simply reflect component halves of the total group. The additional 24% of respondents in the total population include some special education administrative personnel, principals, and a variety of other BI related professionals. It is for this reason that it is important to consider the total population results against the results of the two largest groups of BI service providers.

Section I - Part A

The variables presented in Section I were a list of 30 content and/or skill descriptors that might serve as inservice topics. The first task of the participants was to rank each of those variables on a scale of 1-5 from low to high priority, respectively. Table 1 compares both the mean rating and the relative ranked order of these variables across all three populations. In Table 2 the content/skill variables have been ranked from highest to lowest in terms of the expressed priorities of the survey participants.

The most significant result of the need priority portion of this section is that "curriculum content/materials in: social skills/affective education" ranked as the top priority of all three populations. It is overwhelmingly apparent that professionals involved with BI students feel a great need for inservice training concerning social skills curriculia for BI students.

Further, in addition to information concerning social skills curriculum, the topics of "strategies for coping with job related stress" and "consultation/collaboration with other educators" were high priorities of all three groups. Those three topics were within the top seven choices for all three groups. In fact, with the exception of "coping with stress" which was number seven on the BI teachers' ranked order listing, those three topics appear within the top four choices of all three populations. That represents a remarkable consensus considering the range of topics presented for the participants' attention.

Equally interesting is a comparison of the bottom seven items on each populations' list. Five of the topic choices within the botton seven are the same across all the comparison groups. Thus, it is readily apparent that inservices on "IEPs," "discipline," "environmental management," and the curriculum areas of "music/art" and "P.E." are not of interest to the vast

Table 1

Mean Rating and Rank Order of Inservice Topics

Content/Skill	All Respondents		BI Teachers		Resource Teachers	
	$\bar{x}$ Rating	Rank Order	$\bar{x}$ Rating	Rank Order	$\bar{x}$ Rating	Rank Order
Identification	2.86	15	2.78	17.5	2.96	12
Problem Solving	2.98	7.5	3.14	3	2.91	13.5
Entry/Exit Decisions	2.46	25	2.15	27	2.66	13.5
Motivation Techniques	2.99	6	2.83	13	3.09	7
IEPs	2.49	24	2.40	25	2.60	24
Creativity/Originality	2.89	13	2.88	11	3.00	11
Parent Involvement	2.90	11.5	2.80	15	3.05	8
Math/Science	2.85	16.5	2.97	8	2.82	16
Language/Reading	2.90	11.5	2.84	12	3.12	5.5
Social Studies	2.65	20	2.82	14	2.62	21.5
Vocational/Career	2.91	10	2.92	9.5	2.81	17.5
P.E.	1.86	30	1.90	30	1.67	30
Music/Art	1.88	29	2.07	28	1.70	29
Social Skills	3.34	1	3.32	1	3.34	1
Assertiveness	2.87	14	2.79	16	3.04	9
Individual Management	2.98	7.5	2.69	19	3.29	2
Individual Counseling	3.03	4	3.18	2	2.91	13.5
Group Management	3.00	5	2.92	9.5	3.12	5.5
Environmental Mgt.	2.31	28	1.96	29	2.47	26
Coping with Stress	3.14	2	3.04	6.5	3.26	3
Consultation	3.09	3	3.12	4	3.18	4
Flexibility	2.80	18	2.78	17.5	2.88	15
Discipline	2.45	26	2.28	26	2.57	25
Self Concept	2.62	21	2.46	24	2.81	17.5
Mainstreaming	2.77	19	2.58	21	3.03	10
Humor	2.40	27	2.50	22	2.44	27
Agency Roles/Functions	2.93	9	3.10	5	2.74	19
Street-wise	2.85	16.5	3.05	6.5	2.61	23
Residential Treatment	2.57	22	2.63	20	2.22	28
Empathy	2.51	23	2.47	23	2.62	21.5

Table 2

Rank Order of Inservice Topics By Mean Rating

All Respondents		BI Teachers		Resource Teachers	
Content/Skill	$\bar{x}$ Rating	Content/Skill	$\bar{x}$ Rating	Content/Skill	$\bar{x}$ Rating
Social Skills	3.34	Social Skills	3.32	Social Skills	3.34
*Coping With Stress	3.14	Individual Counseling	3.18	Individual Management	3.29
Consultation	3.09	*Problem Solving	3.14	*Coping With Stress	3.26
Individual Counseling	3.03	Consultation	3.12	Consultation	3.18
Group Management	3.00	Agency Roles/Func.	3.10	Group Management	3.12
Motivation Techniques	2.99	Street-wise	3.05	Language/Reading	3.12
*Problem Solving	2.98	*Coping With Stress	3.05	Motivation Techniques	3.09
Individual Management	2.98	Math/Science	2.97	Parent Involvement	3.05
Agency Roles/ Func.	2.93	Group Management	2.92	*Assertiveness	3.04
Vocational/Career	2.91	Vocational/Career	2.92	Mainstreaming	3.03
Language/Reading	2.90	*Creativity/Orig.	2.88	*Creativity/Orig.	3.00
Parent Involvement	2.90	Language/Reading	2.84	Identification	2.96
*Creativity/Orig.	2.89	Motivation Techniques	2.83	*Problem Solving	2.91
*Assertiveness	2.87	Social Studies	2.82	Individual Counseling	2.91
Identification	2.86	Parent Involvement	2.80	*Flexibility	2.88
Math/Science	2.85	*Assertiveness	2.79	Math/Science	2.82
Street-wise	2.85	Identification	2.78	Vocational/Career	2.81
*Flexibility	2.80	*Flexibility	2.78	*Self Concept	2.81
Mainstreaming	2.77	Individual Management	2.69	Agency Roles/Func.	2.74
Social Studies	2.65	Residential Treatment	2.63	Entry/Exit Decisions	2.66
*Self Concept	2.62	Mainstreaming	2.58	Social Studies	2.62
Residential Treatment	2.57	*Humor	2.50	*Empathy	2.62
*Empathy	2.51	*Empathy	2.47	Street-wise	2.61
IEPs	2.49	*Self Concept	2.46	IEPs	2.60
Entry/Exit Decisions	2.46	IEPs	2.40	Discipline	2.57
Discipline	2.45	Discipline	2.28	Environmental Mgt.	2.47
*Humor	2.40	Entry/Exit Decisions	2.15	*Humor	2.44
Environmental Mgt.	2.31	Music/Art	2.07	Residential Treatment	2.22
Music/Art	1.88	Environmental Mgt.	1.96	Music/Art	1.70
P.E.	1.86	P.E.	1.90	P.E.	1.67

*Topics categorized as "Personal Variables" as opposed to "Skill Variables"

majority of respondents. It would appear that most respondents are comfortable with their ability to formulate an IEP. This is interesting in light of the repeated findings of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education, in their Program Assistance Review (PAR) site visits. There is, repeatedly, a concern with the quality of IEPs reviewed. Perhaps the low ranking of IEPs as an inservice topic merely reflects the participants comfort level with the IEP as accepted within their service unit as opposed to an IEP that is reflective of best practice. Also, given the amount of attention afforded to the IEP in the early implementation years of Public Law 94-142, respondents may simply be "tired" of contined attention to the topic.

The ranking of "discipline" as a low priority topic for BI students might at first appear surprising. However, given the higher rankings of other topics related to behavioral control ("individual management", "group management", and individual counseling") it would appear that while behavoral control techniques are of interest to the respondents, they construct the meaning of "discipline" to be enforcement of rules by which all students must abide (not just BI) and therefore a topic of concern for school administrators as opposed to service providers. This explanation is supported by data from the third task in Section I in which the respondents selected other persons who needed inservice on this topic. The overwhelming choice for recipients of inservice on the topic "discipline" was that of principals.

Another way to consider the data is to examine ranked positions that are highly discrepant. Given a list of 30 topics, a discrepancy of 10 rank positions (therefore, one-third of the itmes) would appear noteworthy. There are six such topics in the priority comparison ranks. While BI teachers ranked "problem solving strategies" as their third highest concern, that topic occupied 13th place on the resource teacher list. Given the range of

interpretations that one might apply to such a topic, it would be highly speculative to discuss why the populations would appear to be so divergent. It is not, however, surprising to find a 17 position discrepancy on the topic of "individual behavior management strategies." BI teachers, typically trained in programs that include substantial components on individual behavior management ranked this topic in the 19th position. Resource teachers, on the other hand, listed it as their 2nd highest priority. The latter group of professionals often do not hold a degree and/or certification in BI. Thus, while they serve the BI population, they do not possess training that is as specifically oriented toward behavior control. Thus, this discrepancy is probably a function of the two populations' relative comfort level concerning behavioral control strategies and is the result of previous training experiences.

An interesting reversal of the above position occurs relative to the topic of individual counseling. While resource teachers ranked it in the second third of their list (14th), BI teachers placed it as their second most important topic. It is suspected that this discrepancy might again relate to previous training experiences. The BI teacher with a training experience that contained a substantial emphasis on individual behavior management might easily have not included a similar emphasis on individual counseling. Thus, the BI teacher response is probably reflective of training experiences which did not include sufficient exposure on this topic.

Mainstreaming is a topic of more interest to resource teachers (ranked 10) than BI teachers (ranked 21). The resource teacher's daily interaction with the classroom environment and therefore the increased need for problem solving relative to this topic is the probable cause of this discrepancy.

Both the total population and BI teachers ranked "roles and functions of various agencies and programs" in their top ten choices (9 and 5 respectively). Resource teachers placed this topic in position 19. This discrepancy is to be expected due to the varying job descriptions of the respondents. The total group, 24% of which is comprised of administrative-type persons, is concerned about their service system and how it fits into the statewide services that are available. Similarly, BI teachers who often serve students who have or will receive services from other agencies are interested in the position they hold in such a service delivery array. Resource teachers, on the other hand, serving a milder population see themselves totally within their service unit and seldom come into contact with other agencies.

One final discrepancy, that on the topic of "being street-wise" is ranked sixth on the BI teachers' priorities and 23rd on the resource teacher list. It would appear that the more severe the BI student, the more likely it is that the teacher will need skills in "being street-wise."

One final way to analyze the data on the priorities of inservice topics is to look at what has been called "personal variables" vs. "content variables." While most of the inservice topics deal with knowledge acquisition, i.e., content variables, some deal with topics concerning personality. These were labeled personal variables. There are eight personal variables within the list of 30 topics: "problem solving", "creativity", "assertiveness", "coping with stress", "flexibility", "self-concept", "humor", and "empathy." Analysis of the distribution of these variables finds them distributed across the entire topic list. That is, as a group, these variables are not seen as being a high priority or a low one. Rather, some are considered high (two occur in the top seven), some are low priorities (one occurs in the bottom seven), and some fall in the middle ranks.

Section I - Part B

The second task of the respondents relative to the 30 possible inservice topics was to indicate the amount of assistance they preferred on the topic. The amount of assistance options included two variations on one time contact ("one time contact with assistance" and "one time contact with additional assistance upon request") and three variations on multiple contacts ("multiple contacts over one or two months," "over the school year," and "over more than one school year"). Tables 3, 4, and 5 display the percentage of respondents selecting each of the five assistance options for each inservice topic. Table 6 groups these responses into percentages for single vs. multiple contacts for each topic and compares these responses across all three populations. For 25 of the 30 inservice topics, data for all three groups showed a preference for single contacts. In five instances (problem solving, social skills curriculum/materials, individual counseling strategies, coping with stress, and consultation) at least one group of respondents indicated that multiple contacts were preferred or at least equally desired.

Despite the initial appearance of these data, it is likely that a clear preference for one time contacts has not been expressed. Several qualifications concerning these data point to such a conclusion.

1. Although one time contacts have the largest respondent percentages in most cases, there are still significantly large numbers of respondents who prefer multiple contacts. That percentage ranges from 12-57. In most instances, 30%-40% of the participants selected multiple contacts. That is a large enough portion of any inservice target group to warrent consideration. One would not want to inappropriately serve 30%-40% of the population even if they are a statistical "minority".

2. As can be seen in Tables 3, 4, and 5, a fairly consistent group of no responses were recorded. Approximately 10%-20% of the respondents made "no" response on any given topic. Given the nearness of the one time/multiple contact division that many "no" responses are potentially significant.

Table 3

Percentage of All Respondents' Preferences Relative to Amount of Assistance Options by Content/Skill Topic

Content/Skill	One Time	One Time w/Request	Several/ Month	Several/ Year	Several/ 1 + Yrs.	No Response
Identification	28	29	11	15	8	8
Problem Solving	20	26	14	17	15	8
Entry/Exit Decisions	38	30	7	12	3	9
Motivation Techniques	23	27	11	22	11	6
IEPs	37	31	9	7	6	9
Creativity/Originality	27	22	14	18	12	8
Parent Involvement	28	26	11	17	9	10
Math/Science	29	30	11	12	7	11
Language/Reading	28	29	13	13	7	11
Social Studies	30	31	11	9	5	13
Vocational/Career	25	30	13	13	8	11
P.E.	45	25	7	3	3	17
Music/Art	42	29	6	3	3	17
Social Skills	24	25	13	19	12	8
Assertiveness	29	23	13	18	10	8
Individual Management	26	28	9	20	7	10
Individual Counseling	26	24	13	20	9	8
Group Management	27	29	13	13	8	10
Environmental Mgt.	43	26	7	7	2	15
Coping with Stress	28	22	12	16	12	10
Consultation	24	22	16	17	13	8
Flexibility	32	25	12	11	8	11
Discipline	36	32	5	6	6	15
Self Concept	36	24	8	11	7	14
Mainstreaming	28	27	11	12	10	12
Humor	44	22	10	6	6	12
Agency Roles/Functions	32	28	12	10	8	9
Street-wise	35	26	8	12	6	13
Residential Treatment	35	30	10	4	7	14
Empathy	41	22	6	10	7	14

Table 4

Percentage of BI Teachers' Preferences Relative to Amount of Assistance Options by Content/Skill Topic

Content/Skill	One Time	One Time w/Request	Several/ Month	Several/ Year	Several/ 1 + Yrs.	No Response
Identification	28	26	9	17	6	14
Problem Solving	10	22	21	22	14	12
Entry/Exit Decisions	37	27	12	8	3	14
Motivation Techniques	22	28	6	18	17	9
IEPs	33	37	8	6	5	10
Creativity/Originality	22	23	15	14	15	10
Parent Involvement	26	21	9	14	13	18
Math/Science	23	27	12	10	13	15
Language/Reading	23	27	14	9	10	17
Social Studies	24	30	12	9	8	18
Vocational/Career	19	32	13	8	14	14
P.E.	35	28	8	3	5	22
Music/Art	31	30	10	3	5	22
Social Skills	24	27	9	15	13	12
Assertiveness	28	23	9	19	10	10
Individual Management	27	24	8	21	8	13
Individual Counseling	22	23	18	18	12	8
Group Management	31	23	10	14	10	12
Environmental Mgt.	45	23	6	4	3	19
Coping With Stress	24	19	14	18	13	12
Consultation	19	28	10	18	17	8
Flexibility	27	22	13	14	10	14
Discipline	30	32	4	4	9	22
Self Concept	33	19	6	12	12	18
Mainstreaming	27	26	13	8	10	17
Humor	37	15	12	12	12	13
Agency Roles/Functions	22	33	13	9	12	12
Street-wise	27	26	8	13	12	15
Residential Treatment	25	24	10	1	10	19
Empathy	33	19	8	12	10	18

Table 5

Percentage of Resource Teachers' Preferences Relative to Amount of Assistance Options by Content/Skill Topic

Content/Skill	One Time	One Time w/Request	Several/ Month	Several/ Year	Several/ 1 + Yrs.	No Response
Identification	27	30	13	15	12	4
Problem Solving	24	26	10	17	15	8
Entry/Exit Decisions	40	27	4	18	6	5
Motivation Techniques	30	19	15	19	12	5
IEPs	39	23	10	9	10	9
Creativity/Originality	30	18	15	21	9	8
Parent Involvement	33	24	13	17	9	4
Math/Science	33	30	9	15	6	6
Language/Reading	27	27	13	19	8	6
Social Studies	35	26	13	12	5	10
Vocational/Career	30	23	13	19	5	10
P.E.	55	19	8	3	3	13
Music/Art	51	23	5	4	3	14
Social Skills	28	18	14	21	13	6
Assertiveness	33	18	12	21	12	5
Individual Management	26	22	13	26	6	8
Individual Counseling	31	21	10	22	9	8
Group Management	23	28	18	15	8	8
Environmental Mgt.	41	23	12	10	3	12
Coping With Stress	33	17	9	17	14	10
Consultation	26	15	21	14	14	10
Flexibility	42	18	10	10	10	9
Discipline	39	31	5	9	6	11
Self Concept	36	22	10	12	8	13
Mainstreaming	28	23	9	19	12	10
Humor	46	26	9	4	3	13
Agency Roles/Functions	42	26	12	6	6	8
Street-wise	45	22	9	8	4	13
Residential Treatment	44	31	6	3	5	12
Empathy	46	17	7	12	6	13

Table 6

Comparison Across Populations of Percentages of Respondents' Preferences Relative to Amount of Assistance Options by Content/Skill Topic

Content/Skill	All Respondents		BI Teachers		Resource Teachers	
	One	Multiple	One	Multiple	One	Multiple
Identification	57	34	54	32	57	40
*Problem Solving	46	46	32	57	50	42
Entry/Exit Decisions	68	22	64	23	67	28
Motivation Techniques	50	44	50	41	49	46
IEPs	68	22	70	19	62	29
Creativity/Originality	49	44	45	44	48	45
Parent Involvement	52	37	47	36	57	39
Math/Science	59	30	50	35	63	30
Language/Reading	57	33	50	33	54	40
Social Studies	61	25	54	29	61	30
Vocational/Career	55	34	51	35	55	37
P.E.	70	13	63	16	74	14
Music/Art	71	12	61	18	74	12
*Social Skills	49	44	51	37	46	48
Assertiveness	52	41	51	38	51	45
Individual Management	54	36	51	37	48	45
*Individual Counseling	50	42	45	48	52	41
Group Management	56	34	54	34	51	41
Environmental Mgt.	69	16	68	13	64	25
*Coping With Stress	50	40	43	45	50	40
*Consultation	46	46	47	45	41	49
Flexibility	57	31	49	37	60	30
Discipline	68	17	62	17	70	20
Self Concept	60	26	52	30	58	30
Mainstreaming	55	33	53	31	51	40
Humor	66	22	52	36	72	16
Agency Roles/Functions	60	30	55	34	68	24
Street-wise	61	26	53	33	67	21
Residential Treatment	65	21	49	21	75	14
Empathy	63	23	52	30	63	25

* Multiple assistance option preferred or equal for at least one population.

3. It is difficult to separate the idea of amount of assistance from the topic under consideration. Thus, if a respondent did not feel that a given content/skill topic was of interest to him/her it is unlikely that he/she would then select it as a topic that required an intense amount of assistance. Perusal of the data, do in fact, show that those topics which were low priorities for all respondent groups (for example, P.E. and music/art) were the topics with the highest percentages in favor of one time contacts. Thus, the interrelatedness of the topic/amount data weakens the apparent strength of the amount of assistance options results.

4. Demographic data on the respondents clearly indicate that those who participated tended to be teachers with more experience than the average. Such a population would feel less in need of extended contacts than might a more representative group with fewer years of service to BI students.

5. The history of inservice must also be considered. Most teachers have only had experience with one time contact inservice. It is, therefore, difficult for them to evaluate that amount of inservice against amounts they have never experienced, i.e., multiple contacts. Related to that is the fact that if they have been pleased with some past one time inservice experiences, for example, the work done by the BI Support Systems Project at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, they may actually be evaluating that specific training experience and not one time contacts in general. These factors combined with the "myth of instant assistance" that prevails would all tend to inflate percentages on preference for one time contact inservice.

6. One final consideration is that multiple contact inservice is often equated with "others watching and evaluating a teacher." The fear of negative evaluation may also reduce the appeal of multiple contacts for some professionals.

Given these qualifiers, it is, perhaps surprising that multiple contacts received such a large percentage of the responses. In that light, it may be that the support for multiple contacts is, in fact, impressive.

In terms of the priority ranking of inservice topics discussed in Part A, there was no difference between "personal variables" as a group in their relative rank compared to the "content variables." There were, however, differences between those two variable types when respondents considered the amount of assistance they preferred. Of the 22 content

variables, two (social skills content/materials and individual counseling) were items for which at least one of the population groups favored multiple contacts. Of the eight personal variables, two (problem solving, and coping with stress), were topics on which at least one of the population groups preferred multiple contacts. Thus, only 9% of the content variables were clearly targeted for multiple contacts while 25% of the personal variables were selected for multiple contacts. It is difficult to say if this phenomenon is the result of the respondents feeling that personal variables require more attention in order for improvement to occur or if it results primarily because of the high priority alloted to two of those items in Part A. The reader will recall the discussion in which it was pointed out that a high priority would likely be seen as needing multiple contacts while a low priority area will not.

Section I - Part C

The final task faced by the respondents in Section I involved the identification of "others" whom the respondents felt might benefit from assistance on the inservice topic. The data were surprisingly consistent in some ways and extremely divergent in others (see Tables 7-9). The major consistency is that two "others" (other special education teachers and regular classroom teachers) accounted for the vast majority of responses. Comparisons of the number of times that one or the other of these populations had the most choices for being in need of assistance on a given topic are presented below as percentages:

All Respondents:
- Regular classroom teachers - 63%
- Other special education teachers - 26%

BI Teachers:
- Other special education teachers - 60%
- Regular classroom teachers - 26%

Resource Teachers:
- Regular classroom teachers - 87%

Table 7

Percentage of All Respondents' Selection of Other Professionals in Need of Assistance by Content/Skill Topic

Content/Skill	Other Spec. Ed.	Princ.	Super./ S.E. Direct.	Couns/ Psych.	Regular Teachers	Aides	Secr/ Cust.	Other/ Missg.	None
Identification	12	9	5	28	35	3	0	6	3
Problem Solving	23	8	4	10	39	5	0	7	3
Entry/Exit Decisions	19	14	13	22	14	2	0	10	6
Motivation Techniques	21	3	1	6	51	7	0	6	5
IEPs	40	7	6	5	28	0	0	6	8
Creativity/Originality	31	1	1	3	51	3	0	7	4
Parent Involvement	31	10	3	13	23	1	0	14	5
Math/Science	35	2	2	2	39	4	0	11	5
Language/Reading	32	3	2	3	39	5	0	11	5
Social Studies	32	2	3	2	41	4	0	12	4
Vocational/Career	38	2	3	9	30	3	0	11	5
P.E.	28	2	3	3	37	3	0	17	8
Music/Art	28	2	3	4	36	3	0	16	8
Social Skills	35	2	2	6	35	6	1	10	4
Assertiveness	26	4	3	4	41	9	1	7	5
Individual Management	24	2	1	5	47	6	0	11	4
Individual Counseling	28	3	1	26	25	4	0	10	4
Group Management	25	2	1	3	50	4	0	10	5
Environmental Mgt.	25	2	2	2	47	5	1	14	7
Coping With Stress	36	4	2	5	29	6	0	14	3
Consultation	34	6	4	6	33	1	0	13	3
Flexibility	26	2	1	2	49	4	1	11	5
Discipline	15	38	5	3	16	3	0	16	5
Self Concept	34	2	1	1	36	5	0	15	6
Mainstreaming	23	7	2	5	46	2	0	13	2
Humor	24	4	2	2	42	5	1	15	6
Agency Roles/Functions	23	13	9	21	16	2	0	13	4
Street-wise	25	5	1	9	36	4	0	15	5
Residential Treatment	23	13	16	17	8	1	0	18	5
Empathy	24	5	2	3	37	6	0	16	6

Table 8

Percentage of BI Teachers' Selection of Other Professionals in Need of Assistance by Content/Skill Topic

Content/Skill	Other Spec. Ed.	Princ.	Super./ S.E. Direct.	Couns/ Psych.	Regular Teachers	Aides	Secr/ Cust.	Other/ Missg.	None
Identification	12	8	9	31	27	3	0	9	3
Problem Solving	22	4	5	12	35	10	0	9	4
Entry/Exit Decisions	22	14	14	15	12	3	0	14	6
Motivation Techniques	21	3	4	8	37	13	0	9	5
IEPs	46	8	6	5	18	0	0	9	8
Creativity/Originality	36	1	1	1	40	8	0	10	3
Parent Involvement	27	8	6	15	15	1	0	21	6
Math/Science	40	1	0	0	32	8	0	14	5
Language/Reading	35	5	0	0	30	9	0	17	5
Social Studies	37	3	1	0	30	8	0	17	5
Vocational/Career	40	1	0	4	26	4	0	18	8
P.E.	33	3	3	0	24	4	0	22	12
Music/Art	32	1	4	1	24	5	0	22	10
Social Skills	35	1	4	3	27	8	1	17	5
Assertiveness	27	1	3	4	36	15	1	9	4
Individual Management	23	4	1	3	37	14	0	13	5
Individual Counseling	32	4	3	19	19	8	0	10	5
Group Management	32	1	1	1	40	8	0	10	6
Environmental Mgt.	24	1	3	0	39	9	0	17	8
Coping With Stress	37	5	3	5	18	13	0	15	4
Consultation	42	5	3	3	27	1	0	17	3
Flexibility	32	3	1	1	33	8	1	17	4
Discipline	15	27	6	0	18	6	0	21	5
Self Concept	39	1	3	0	26	8	0	21	4
Mainstreaming	23	9	1	4	41	1	0	17	4
Humor	32	1	1	1	32	10	0	19	4
Agency Roles/Functions	23	9	6	17	21	4	0	17	4
Street-wise	28	3	1	5	32	8	0	18	5
Residential Treatment	30	12	9	10	9	1	0	23	6
Empathy	27	4	3	3	27	10	0	23	4

Table 9

Percentage of Resource Teachers' Selection of Other Professionals in Need of Assistance by Content/Skill Topic

Content/Skill	Other Spec. Ed.	Princ.	Super./ S.E. Direct.	Couns/ Psych.	Regular Teachers	Aides	Secr/ Cust.	Other/ Missg.	None
Identification	6	10	3	24	46	3	0	3	5
Problem Solving	15	13	3	8	49	4	0	9	4
Entry/Exit Decisions	18	10	13	28	17	3	0	5	6
Motivation Techniques	13	3	0	3	68	6	0	4	5
IEPs	23	8	8	5	40	0	0	4	13
Creativity/Originality	18	0	0	1	71	0	0	5	5
Parent Involvement	24	15	1	8	36	1	0	9	5
Math/Science	27	3	3	3	47	4	0	6	8
Language/Reading	24	1	3	4	50	4	0	6	8
Social Studies	24	1	3	3	53	3	0	8	6
Vocational/Career	31	1	4	13	37	3	0	6	5
P.E.	15	1	0	5	54	4	0	13	8
Music/Art	17	1	0	5	53	4	0	13	8
Social Skills	27	1	0	9	49	4	0	5	5
Assertiveness	23	5	1	5	50	5	0	5	5
Individual Management	19	0	0	8	59	3	0	8	4
Individual Counseling	22	1	0	24	36	4	0	8	5
Group Management	14	0	0	4	65	4	0	8	5
Environmental Mgt.	19	1	0	3	55	4	1	9	8
Coping With Stress	31	5	3	5	41	3	0	9	4
Consultation	21	5	6	8	45	1	0	10	4
Flexibility	17	1	0	3	64	3	0	6	6
Discipline	14	45	1	6	17	1	0	9	6
Self Concept	25	0	0	3	49	5	0	10	8
Mainstreaming	18	3	1	6	59	1	0	9	1
Humor	13	5	1	3	54	5	0	9	10
Agency Roles/Functions	17	18	9	26	17	1	0	6	6
Street-wise	14	5	0	12	45	4	0	12	9
Residential Treatment	15	15	17	23	8	1	0	13	8
Empathy	17	8	1	4	46	7	0	8	10

Thus, those two groups accounted for 89% of the first choices for all respondents, 86% of the first choices for BI teachers, and 87% of the first choices for resource teachers.

Interesting exceptions to this trend are listed below. For the total respondent group there is a listing of the topics that were exceptions to the above consensus and the person(s) who were chosen instead.

All Respondents:

1) Identification - counselors/psychologists
2) Entry/Exit Decisions - divided across all options
3) Parent Involvement - divided across all options
4) Individual Counseling - counselors/psychologists
5) Discipline - principals
6) Agency Roles/Functions - divided across all options
7) Residential Treatment - divided across all options

On some topics respondents displayed a stronger preference than on others relative to the benefits of inservice to other persons. Looking at data from all the respondents, the following topics were strongly felt to be of benefit to the groups indicated: (1) for the other special education teacher group, percentages of 35-40% were indicated for the topics of IEPs, math/science, and vocational/career; that is, 35-40% of the respondents felt that other special education teachers were highly appropriate for assistance on those topics; (2) for "regular classroom teachers," 45% or more of the respondents felt them to be highly appropriate persons to benefit from assistance on motivation techniques, individual behavior management, group management, environmental management, flexibility, mainstreaming, humor, and social skills. It would appear that special educators find regular classroom teachers to be in need of assistance on topics that are a typical part of the "specialists" training

experiences, but not the regular educators' training experiences.

In general the responses to task three are fairly stereotypic That is, teachers are seen as the primary service providers and therefore in need of a wealth of content information. However, there are predictable exceptions such as principals needing information on discipline and counselors needing assistance on identification of BI. Although these data do not speak to it, it would be intersting to know if these stereotypic exceptions result from a respondent's individual experience or from his/her perception of the roles of professionals within the total service environment.

Section II - Part A

The first half of section two required the respondents to rank a list of 25 possible formats for continued professional development in terms of the format's desirability to them. The mean rating of each format across all three populations is presented in Table 10. Table 11 arranges those means in ranked order from most to least desirable. The results of these ranked orders are amazingly consistent. The top ten desired formats are identical for all three respondent groups. Although the order varies within each group, all three populations preferred the same types of formats. Thus, it is very clear that professional development formats which offer salary credit and college credit are top priorities of all respondents. Formats that can be described as school visitations, "hands on", supervisory support, observations, staff/peer support, release time, conference/workshops and problems solving sessions are those which respondents are most desirous of. Within this group of ten preferred formats there are only two discrepancies which might signal a significant difference between BI teachers and resource teachers. The former group ranked staff/peer support considerably higher

Table 10

Mean Ratings of Desirability of
Format for All Populations

Format	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
Observations	3.75	3.85	3.64
Visitations	3.90	3.97	3.80
Demos/Simul.	3.16	3.28	3.07
Weekend Offerings	2.31	2.09	2.52
"Hands On"	3.84	3.69	4.15
Video Tapes	2.84	2.99	2.62
Conf./Wkshps.	3.56	3.52	3.69
Salary Credit	4.05	4.13	4.04
College Credit	3.92	3.96	4.05
Tchr/Child Exchanges	2.72	2.54	2.92
Retreats	2.87	3.00	2.68
Panel Discussions	2.20	2.24	2.05
Summer Seminars	2.85	2.57	3.11
Reg. Study Grps.	2.46	2.55	2.22
Release Time	3.59	3.55	3.65
Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.50	3.87	3.30
Staff/Peer Support	3.71	4.08	3.55
Superv. Support	3.77	3.88	3.74
Tchr. Consultants	3.30	3.47	3.08
"Make & Take"	2.83	2.71	3.10
Perm. Floating Subs	3.14	3.50	2.93
Brown Bag	2.48	2.41	2.39
Early Bird	1.92	1.81	2.00
Sht. Term Sabbaticals	3.32	3.45	3.16
Personal Contracts	2.68	2.80	2.49

Table 11

Rank Order of Desirability of
Format for All Populations

All Respondents		BI Teachers		Resource Teachers	
Format	$\bar{x}$ Rating	Format	$\bar{x}$ Rating	Format	$\bar{x}$ Rating
Salary Credit	4.05	Salary Credit	4.13	"Hands On"	4.15
College Credit	3.92	Staff/Peer Support	4.08	College Credit	4.05
Visitations	3.90	Visitations	3.97	Salary Credit	4.04
"Hands On"	3.84	College Credit	3.96	Visitations	3.80
Superv. Support	3.77	Superv. Support	3.88	Superv. Support	3.74
Observations	3.75	Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.87	Conf./Wkshps.	3.69
Staff/Peer Support	3.71	Observations	3.85	Release Time	3.65
Release Time	3.59	"Hands On"	3.69	Observations	3.64
Conf./Wkshps.	3.56	Release Time	3.55	Staff/Peer Support	3.55
Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.50	Conf./Wkshps.	3.52	Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.30
Sht. Term Sabbaticals	3.32	Perm. Floating Subs	3.50	Sht. Term Sabbaticals	3.16
Tchr. Consultants	3.30	Tchr. Consultants	3.47	Summer Seminars	3.11
Demos/Simul.	3.16	Sht. Term Sabbaticals	3.45	"Make & Take"	3.10
Perm. Floating Subs	3.14	Demos/Simul.	3.28	Tchr. Consultants	3.08
Retreats	2.87	Retreats	3.00	Demos/Simul.	3.07
Summer Seminars	2.85	Video Tapes	2.99	Perm. Floating Subs	2.93
Video Tapes	2.84	Personal Contracts	2.80	Tchr/Child Exchanges	2.92
"Make & Take"	2.83	"Make & Take"	2.71	Retreats	2.68
Tchr/Child Exchanges	2.72	Summer Seminars	2.57	Video Tapes	2.62
Personal Contracts	2.68	Reg. Study Grps.	2.55	Weekend Offerings	2.52
Brown Bag	2.48	Tchr/Child Exchanges	2.54	Personal Contracts	2.49
Reg. Study Grps.	2.46	Brown Bag	2.41	Brown Bag	2.39
Weekend Offerings	2.31	Panel Discussions	2.24	Reg. Study Grps.	2.22
Panel Discussions	2.20	Weekend Offerings	2.09	Panel Discussions	2.05
Early Bird	1.92	Early Bird	1.81	Early Bird	2.00

(Number 2) than resource teachers (Number 9). On the other hand, resource teachers ranked "hands on" formats as their number one choice while BI teachers ranked it as number eight.

Equally clear is the consensus on the least desired formats for assistance. Five of the last six choices for all populations were identical, although the order varied for each group. It is readily apparent that brown-bag sessions, regional study groups, weekend offerings, panel discussions, and early bird sessions are not considered desirable formats for inservice offerings.

Section II - Part B

The second task of Section II was to rate the effectiveness of the formats. Table 12 displays the mean ratings for the perceived effectiveness of each format. Table 13 ranks those formats from high to low for all three population groups. Again, there is incredible similarity. Nine of the top ten choices for each group are identical although the order varies somewhat. Further, four of the last six choices were identical, making it clear which formats are considered least effective.

It is not suprising that there is a high correlation between those formats that respondents perceived as desirable and those they perceived as effective. Presumably respondents do not desire to participate in ineffective formats. This comparison is presented on Table 14. The top ten (highest priorities) and the bottom six (lowest priorities) are presented. The comparisons are as straightforward as any survey could hope to produce. When comparing desirability and effectiveness of formats the following is clear:

For All Respondents

High Choice Comparisons- All ten are the same
Low Choice Comparisons- Five out of six are the same

Table 12

Mean Rating of Effectiveness of Format for All Populations

Format	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
Observations	3.34	3.40	3.25
Visitations	3.57	3.62	3.50
Demos/Simul.	3.03	3.17	2.90
Weekend Offerings	2.67	2.55	2.76
"Hands On"	3.85	3.75	4.11
Video Tapes	2.80	2.89	2.67
Conf./Wkshps.	3.42	3.50	3.54
Salary Credit	3.64	3.73	3.57
College Credit	3.60	3.59	3.79
Tch./Child Exchanges	2.66	2.48	2.92
Retreats	2.68	2.81	2.53
Panel Discussions	2.09	2.08	2.04
Summer Seminars	2.94	2.80	3.12
Reg. Study Grps.	2.50	2.55	2.30
Release Time	3.27	3.16	3.39
Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.35	3.55	3.29
Staff/Peer Support	3.55	3.91	3.45
Superv. Support	3.56	3.74	3.51
Tchr. Consultants	3.10	3.27	2.96
"Make & Take"	2.85	2.81	3.11
Perm. Floating Subs	2.86	3.06	2.84
Brown Bag	2.44	2.32	2.37
Early Bird	2.01	1.96	2.09
Sht. Term Sabbaticals	3.11	3.30	3.01
Personal Contracts	2.66	2.77	2.47

Table 13

Rank Order of Effectiveness of Format for All Populations

All Respondents		BI Teachers		Resource Teachers	
Format	$\bar{x}$ Rating	Format	$\bar{x}$ Rating	Format	$\bar{x}$ Rating
"Hands On"	3.85	Staff/Peer Support	3.91	"Hands On"	4.11
Salary Credit	3.64	"Hands On"	3.75	College Credit	3.79
College Credit	3.60	Superv. Support	3.74	Salary Credit	3.57
Visitations	3.57	Salary Credit	3.73	Conf./Wkshps.	3.54
Superv. Support	3.56	Visitations	3.62	Superv. Support	3.51
Staff/Peer Support	3.55	College Credit	3.59	Visitations	3.50
Conf./Wkshps.	3.42	Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.55	Staff/Peer Support	3.45
Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.35	Conf./Wkshps.	3.50	Release Time	3.39
Observations	3.34	Observations	3.40	Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.29
Release Time	3.27	Sht. Term Sabbaticals	3.30	Observations	3.25
Sht. Term Sabbaticals	3.11	Tchr. Consultants	3.27	Summer Seminars	3.12
Tchr. Consultants	3.10	Demos/Simul.	3.17	"Make & Take"	3.11
Demos/Simul.	3.[illegible]	Release Time	3.16	Sht. Term Sabbaticals	3.01
Summer Seminars	2.94	Perm. Floating Subs	3.06	Tchr. Consultants	2.96
Perm. Floating Subs	2.86	Video Tapes	2.89	Tchr./Child Exchanges	2.92
"Make & Take"	2.85	Retreats	2.81	Demos/Simul.	2.90
Video Tapes	2.80	"Make & Take"	2.81	Perm. Floating Subs	2.84
Retreats	2.68	Summer Seminars	2.80	Weekend Offerings	2.76
Weekend Offerings	2.67	Personal Contracts	2.77	Video Tapes	2.67
Tchr/Child Exchanges	2.66	Weekend Offerings	2.55	Retreats	2.53
Personal Contracts	2.66	Reg. Study Grps.	2.55	Personal Contracts	2.47
Reg. Study Grps.	2.50	Tchr/Child Exchanges	2.48	Brown Bag	2.37
Brown Bag	2.44	Brown Bag	2.32	Reg. Study Grps.	2.30
Panel Discussions	2.09	Panel Discussions	2.08	Early Bird	2.09
Early Bird	2.01	Early Bird	1.96	Panel Discussions	2.04

Table 14

Comparison of Rank Order of
Desirability and Effectiveness of
Format for All Populations

All Respondents		BI Teachers		Resource Teachers	
Desir.	Effec.	Desir.	Effec.	Desir.	Effec.
:lary Credit	"Hands On"	Salary Credit	Staff/Peer Sup.	"Hands On"	"Hands On"
'llege Credit	Salary Credit	Staff/Peer Sup.	"Hands On"	College Credit	College Credit
sitations	College Credit	Visitations	Superv. Suppt.	Salary Credit	Salary Credit
'ands On"	Visitations	College Credit	Salary Credit	Visitations	Conf./Wkshps
;perv. Suppt.	Superv. Suppt.	Superv. Suppt.	Visitations	Superv. Suppt.	Superv. Suppt.
)servations	Staff/Peer Sup.	Prob. Sol. Ses.	College Credit	Conf./Wkshps.	Visitations
:aff/Peer Sup.	Conf./Wkshps.	Observations	Prob. Sol. Ses.	Release Time	Staff/Peer Sup.
:lease Time	Prob. Sol. Ses.	"Hands On"	Conf./Wkshps.	Observations	Release Time
)nf./Wkshps.	Observations	Release Time	Observations	Staff/Peer Sup.	Prob. Sol. Ses.
'ob. Sol. Ses.	Release Time	Conf./Wkshps.	Sht. Term Sabb.	Prob. Sol. Ses.	Observations
@@@@		@@@@		@@@@	
	@@@@		@@@@		@@@@
@@@@		@@@@		@@@@	
	@@@@		@@@@		@@@@
@@@@		@@@@		@@@@	
	@@@@		@@@@		@@@@
@@@@		@@@@		@@@@	
	@@@@		@@@@		@@@@
@@@@		@@@@		@@@@	
:rs. Cont.	Reg. Study Grp.	Reg. Study Grp.	Weekend Offer.	Weekend Offer.	Retreats
'own Bag	Brown Bag	Tch./Child Exc.	Reg. Study Grp.	Pers. Cont.	Pers. Cont.
:g. Study Grp.	Panel Disc.	Brown Bag	Tch./Child Exc.	Brown Bag	Brown Bag
:ekend Offer.	Early Bird	Panel Disc.	Brown Bag	Reg. Study Grp.	Reg. Study Grp.
:nel Disc.	Pers. Cont.	Weekend Offer.	Panel Disc.	Panel Disc.	Early Bird
:rly Bird	Tch./Child Exc.	Early Bird	Early Bird	Early Bird	Panel Disc.

For BI Teachers

High Choices Comparisons - Nine out of ten are the same
Low Choices Comparisons - All six are the same

Resource Teachers

High Choice Comparisons - All ten are the same
Low Choice Comparisons - Five out of six are the same

The manner in which all participants choose to receive their continued professional development as well as the manner in which they choose not to receive it is readily apparent.

Section III

Information from some of the questions in this section has been presented in the proceedures section of this report. It is primary demographic data and will not be reviewed here. The remaining information is presented below by topic.

Number of Inservice Presentations. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of inservice activities they participated in during the past year. Figure 3 summarizes that data in percentages.

Figure 3

Number of Inservice Activities	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
None	4	4	4
1 - 2	22	23	26
3 - 4	31	26	31
5 - 6	16	17	18
7 - 8	7	9	4
9 or more	8	7	9
No Response	12	14	9

The mean number attended was 3.7, however, this must be considered as slightly conservative since all response over nine were discounted by the computer when figuring the mean. Although there are no comparison data available, this would be interesting information for future comparisons against other special education categories and within BI service providers across years.

BI Focus. Respondents were next asked to indicate how many of the inservice activities they attended were specifically focused on BI. The summary of those percentages appears in Figure 4.

Figure 4

Number of BI Focused Activities	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
None	28	17	42
1 - 2	41	38	46
3 - 4	15	19	6
5 - 6	5	9	0
7 - 8	1	3	0
9 or more	2	3	0
No Response	9	12	5

The mean number which were BI focued was 2.4. Again, for the reason explained above, this figure is slightly conservative. The data, when compared to Figure 3, reveal that approximately two-thirds of all inservice activities attended by respondents were BI specific.

Satisfaction. This question asked respondents to indicate whether or not they had been pleased with inservice they attended. An open ended opportunity asked them to explain why or why not. The percentage of responses in each category for all population groups in presented in Figure 5.

Figure 5

Response	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
Yes	68	72	63
No	26	23	30
No Response	6	5	8

As can be seen, the majority, 68%, were satisfied with the inservice they attended. The comments generated by the opportunity to indicate why they were satisfied were categerized into four groups. Of the 30 usuable comments, the following distribution occurred:

1. Qualifications (background/training) of the presentor - 6
2. Direct application to current work/problems - 15
3. New ideas/people, cognitive stimulation, and/or information - 7
4. Mechanics/logistics - 2

Approximately one-fourth of the respondents were not satisfied with their inservice offerings. Those who commented generated 44 usable qualifiers:

1. Repetitious, not new - 13
2. Not useful in my setting/age - 25
3. Too time consuming/waste of time - 6
4. Mechanics/logistics - 2

The ability or lack thereof of the inservice to provide practical information that is directly applicable to the respondent's job seems to be the main criterion by which an inservice activity is judged.

College Courses. When asked how many college courses had been completed in the past year, the following data were recorded by percentage:

Figure 6

Number of Courses	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
None	47	44	44
1 - 2	27	26	29
3 - 4	10	14	10
5 - 6	6	8	8
7 - 8	3	1	5
9 or more	2	3	0
No Response	5	6	5

The mean number of courses was 3.0, although this figure is, once again, slightly conservative and misleading since it is averaged from the answers which indicated some coursework. It is equally as important to note that nearly half of the population was not pursuing any college coursework. This fact would tend to emphasize the need for the availability of quality inservice offerings.

Professional Growth Plan. Respondents were asked to indicate yes or no and please explain if the question "do you have a professional growth plan in mind for yourself?" Nearly three-fourths of the respondents incicated that they did have such a plan.

Figure 7

Professional Growth Plan?	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
Yes	74	71	77
No	23	27	21
No Response	3	3	3

The following list explains the specific type of plan being pursued by those who responded affirmatively:

1. Post baccalaureate degree - 47
2. Certification/endorsement - 20
3. College courses/summer school/exchange programs - 20
4. Workshops/conferences/inservice - 11
5. Changing jobs/exit education - 5
6. District-wide plans - 4

Of those who did not have professional growth plans and who provided explanations, the following reasons were cited:

1. Already completed programs - 4
2. Financial - 2
3. Changing fields/new to work force - 2

There is certainly a potentially large role available for inservice activities in a population that has so many pursuing professional growth.

Grown As A Professional? When respondents were asked if they felt they had grown as a professional over the past year the overwhelming majority answered yes. As Figure 8 indicates, 90% or more of each population felt they had grown.

Figure 8

Grown As A Professional?	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
Yes	91	90	92
No	5	6	4
No Response	4	4	4

Many persons indicated what had enabled them to grow. Categorized, those enabling factors were:

1. Experience with students - 87
2. Courses/study abroad/academic degrees - 40
3. Other people (sharing, talking, support) - 38
4. Reading/periodicals - 26
5. Workshops/inservice/conference/professional organization - 45
6. Personal motivation - 19

A few persons responded concerning what they felt had prevented personal growth:

1. No time - 2
2. Fatigue/no motivation - 2
3. No access - 1
4. Not beneficial - 2

These results of these data compared to that of Figure 7 indicate that an overwhelming majority of professionals felt that they had experienced personal growth, some with a growth plan and others without one.

Support. The respondents were asked to rate each person(s) on a list of persons from whom respondents derived support regarding their job. A 1 indicated little support while a 9 indicated most support. The mean scores for each possible support person(s) is presented in Figure 9. Figure 10 displays the ranked order of those persons for each population. Other special education teachers were the greatest source of support for all three populations. Family members were also extremely important to all three groups. Non-handicapped students were found to be of the least support to all groups. Two interesting discrepancies arose. BI teachers find handicapped students to be very little support while resource teachers valt them much higher. BI teachers find building administrators to be a

good source of support while resource teachers find them to be very little support.

Figure 9

Possible Sources of Support	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
Other S.E. teachers	6.17	6.15	6.45
Classroom teachers	5.13	5.33	5.03
Family members	5.69	5.58	5.88
Individual friends	5.02	4.96	5.19
Handicapped students	5.09	4.61	5.54
Non-handicapped students	3.31	3.30	3.29
Psych./consult.	5.10	4.95	4.94
Building administrators	5.38	5.71	4.78
S.E. directors	4.57	4.27	4.79

Figure 10

Possible Sources of Support	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
Other S.E. teachers	1	1	1
Classroom teachers	4	4	5
Family members	2	3	2
Individual friends	7	5	4
Handicapped students	6	7	3
Non-handicapped students	9	9	9
Psych./consult.	5	6	6
Building administrators	3	2	8
S.E. directors	8	8	7

Continue in BI Related Position. When asked to indicate how long they intended to remain in a position where they would serve BI students, a large percentage of respondents indicated a substantial time commitement (see Figure 11.)

Figure 11

Continue in BI	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
Current year	7	6	6
Next year	9	8	9
2 - 5 years	22	15	27
5 or more years	6	5	5
Indefinitely	36	36	35
Undecided	15	22	14
No Response	5	8	4

The 2 - 5 years, 6 or more years, and indefinitely categories encompass 64% of the "All Respondents" group. While this is encouraging, it still means that nearly 40% of the current professionals have not made a definite long-term commitment to the field. Given the repeatedly cited high attrition rates, this number is disconcerting to a field with a teacher shortage.

Continue in an Education Related Position. The comparison of Figure 11 to Figure 12 indicates that more persons have a long-term commitment to education, generally than to BI, specifically, although there was also a larger undecided population.

Figure 12

Continue In Education	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
Current year	3	4	1
Next year	3	4	3
2 - 5 years	14	4	22

Continue In Education	All Respondents	BI Teachers	Resource Teachers
6 or more years	10	8	10
Indefinitely	48	54	42
Undecided	20	23	19
No Response	3	4	3

Enjoyable Aspects. When asked what aspects of their job that they most enjoyed, respondents generated several hundred responses. Those responses were grouped into categories and are presented below along with the number of times that that type of response was given.

1. Student-related variable - 158
2. Professional relationships - 98
3. Teaching-specific variables, i.e., large group work, small group work, programming, testing - 80
4. Intangible personal satisfaction, i.e., freedom, flexibility, challenge - 66
5. Parent contact - 15
6. Concrete benefits, i.e., salary, vacation, meals - 12

Despite past speculation that students are responsible for "burning out" teachers, it appears that student contact is, in fact, the single most enjoyable aspect of the BI professionals' job. It is obvious that respondents as a group do not pursue their BI related positions for their concrete benefits!

Least Enjoyable Aspects. The several hundred responses generated in answer to the question concerning what the respondents enjoyed least about their jobs have been grouped by type of response and summarize below:

1. Relationships (students, other professionals, parents) - 130

2. Paperwork - 81

3. Job requirements/description - 69

4. Time commitment - 44

5. Concrete benefits/intangible benefits - 39

6. Program organization - 30

7. Inadequate program/service options - 17

8. Professional development - 7

Causes of Frustration. Assuming that least enjoyable aspects of the respondents' job would be highly correlated to the most frustrating aspects, the responses to this question on job frustration were grouped in the same fashion as least enjoyable aspects. Those responses are:

1. Relationships (students, professionals, parents) - 157

2. Program Organization - 59

3. Job requirements/description - 44

4. Concrete benefits/intangible benefits - 40

5. Time commitment - 37

6. Paperwork - 36

7. Inadequate programs/service options - 36

8. Professional development - 3

As can be seen, causes of job frustration are not necessarily synonymous with the least enjoyable aspects of the respondents' jobs. While the top selection and the bottom two are the same and groups three, four, and five hold approximately the same positions, the relative positions of program organization and paperwork are considerably different. While paperwork is obviously not enjoyable, it is not one of the more frustrating aspects of the job. Similarly, program organization is extremely frustrating but is not largely responsible for respondents not enjoying their jobs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Presented herein is a series of recommendations drawn from the vast array of data generated by the Professional Development Needs Survey. The organization of these recommendations parallels the major parameters of professional development investigated as part of the statewide needs assessment in BI and includes the categories of: content priorities, amount of assistance, trainees and format. While the recommendations are subdivided into these four, discrete categories, it is important to recognize that there are interrelationships between and among recommendations across the various categories. Thus, for example, the recommendations regarding content priorities are presented independently; however, their implications must also be considered in light of recommendations delineated under the categories of format and amount of assistance. The Recommendations section concludes with some suggestions related to the design and implementation of a statewide needs assessment.

Content Priorities

1. At least three topics must be given highest priority for inclusion in future inservice activities for professionals working in the area of BI in Nebraska. These three topics are: social skills curriculum/materials, coping with job related stress and consultation/collaboration. All three areas ranked within the top seven topics selected across all populations surveyed.

   In many respects these topics are predictable in light of

current conditions in the field of BI as well as special education and even education in general. Examination of current practice within classrooms for behavior disordered children and youth has revealed a disconcerting lack of emphasis upon the development of social/affective skills. This is particularly true of programs for behavior disordered adolescents. While behavior disordered students exhibit numerous problems in the area of social/personal skills, current classes have come under criticism for the relative lack of time devoted to the teaching of social skills as an actual part of the curriculum within the classroom. It is gratifying to see that professionals in Nebraska perceive the need to address this void. While it is not the intent of this report to suggest specific solutions, attention is called to the existence of several notable curricula in the area of social skills. For example, Goldstein's Social Learning Curriculum and Stephens et al's Teaching Children Basic Skills. These curricula as well as others of good quality may already be utilized in Nebraska. Therefore, it may be possible to draw upon existing resources and expertise to address this specific inservice training priority.

Consultation/collaboration skills are also somewhat predictable as an inclusion as a content priority. Given the increased emphasis upon shared responsibility for students inherent in current educational practices such as mainstreaming and the implementation of the least restrictive

alternative, skills related to consultation/collaboration have taken on greater meaning. Moreover given the importance of relationships between and among teachers and other professionals and parents in the assessment of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with one's employment, it appears that inservice which would increase skills in interpersonal communication and cooperation could have multiple impacts. Again there are existing materials available relative to consultation/collaboration which have found popularity in current special education practice, e.g. Tharp, 1975; McKenzie, 1972, etc.

Finally, it has been documented in education in general that professionals functioning in today's schools are finding themselves in greater need of inservice related stress management or coping with job related stress. It is, therefore, not surprising to find BI professionals expressing a need congruent with the needs of the profession as a whole.

2. The topic of group management, although not as highly rated as the previous three topics, does warrant inclusion as a priority since it did rank within the top ten needs across all populations surveyed. Again, the need for such a skill/content emphasis is not unexpected in light of current concern and practice in the area of BI. Historically preservice and inservice training experiences for professionals serving behavior disordered children and youth have emphasized individual management strategies. More recently, however, need to expandthis focus to groups has become

evident. Given the influence of peers and "the group" on behavior disordered adolescents and the greater proportion of group instruction encountered by behavior disordered students being integrated into regular classes, the need for professionals to expand their skills in the area of group management becomes apparent.

3. When considering the needs of BI teachers as a distinct group, inservice content priorities should include the topics of (a) problem-solving strategies, (b) individual counseling, (c) agency roles/functions, (d) street-wise knowledge, (e) vocational/career curriculum content and materials, and (f) math/science curriculum content and materials. While these did not receive the unanimously high ratings across populations accorded the topics listed in Recommendations #1 and 2, they did rank within the top ten topics selected by the BI teachers as a group. For that reason they warrant inclusion in the design of future inservice for this specific group.
4. Using that same rationale, the topics of (a) individual management, (b) mainstreaming, (c) motivation techniques, (d) parent involvement, (e) language/reading curriculum content and materials and (f) assertiveness warrant consideration as priorities within future inservice for resource teachers serving BI children and youth.
5. While there may be some hesitancy to proffer negative recommendations, it seems that, at least for the time being, inservice which emphasizes (a) IEPs, (b) discipline,

(c) environmental management, (d) music/art curriculum content and materials and (3) P.E. curriculum content and materials, needs to be offered (if at all offered) only after the most judicious consideration. This is recommended in light of the consistently low ratings accorded these topics across all populations responding. While we are cognizant of the implicitness of something being "on the bottom" in a ranking system, the consistency of the data in this case probably signals that the relative lack of interest and motivation attributed to the aforementioned topics should be attended to when designing future inservice.

Amount of Assistance

1. Although the data regarding preferences for single contact vs multiple contact assistance must be treated cautiously, there does appear to be sufficient strength in the level of multiple contact preference to warrant its inclusion as a variable in need of consideration in the design of continuing professional development activities for BI professional in Nebraska. While multiple contact assistance may have utility in relation to any particular inservice contact, it is important to note that the data support is usage in particular with those topics given highest priority in terms of content, e.g. social skills, coping with stress, consultation, etc. Moreover, further credence is added to the use of multiple contact assistance when one considers that several of the formats consistently selected as both

desirable and effective across all respondents are ones which imply longer term, ongoing, more indepth assistance, e.g. "hands on" practicum, supervisory support, peer/staff support. These data when combined with previous findings of the National Needs Analysis Project regarding the overwhelming disenchantment with "one time-two hour spiels", must be regarded by inservice developers as a signal to achieve a more equitable balance in the amount of assistance they provide.

2. Implicit in most models of multiple contact assistance is the need for the availability of larger numbers of persons at the "grass roots level." That is, ongoing, long term assistance as a form of professional development probably is most effectively and efficiently delivered by one's own colleagues as opposed to outside experts. For that reason, it becomes particularly important that there exist some comprehensive inventory of resources (human and programmatic) within a state which can be routinely tapped to provide multiple contact assistance. Nebraska is indeed fortunate to already possess such information in the form of a document entitled A Directory of Professional Expertise and Programs for the Education of Behaviorally Impaired Children in Nebraska, University of Nebraska-Lincoln: Support System Project for Behaviorally Impaired, 1982. Because of the value such a resource document can play in the development of a comprehensive program of personnel development within a specific field such as BI, it is hoped that future

inservice plans would include the updating and dissemination of the aforementioned publication as needed.

Trainees

1. While it may be beyond the scope of this particular project to make recommendations for professional development activities for populations other than those who were the respondents to the survey, the information generated as part of the BI needs assessment did provide some interesting perceptions which probably should be considered in future inservice planning. For example the consistent selection of regular classroom teachers and other special education teachers as those who would benefit most from inservice is difficult to ignore. Obviously those professional who serve BI children and youth feel that such service would be enhanced if these other two populations were also targeted for inservice. The significance of this interpretation is strengthened by the data which indicate that respondents selected other special education teachers as their greatest source of support. Given the important role these other special education teachers play in the functioning of BI professionals and in light of their designation as one of the two groups most in need of inservice, it might well be worth considering future inservice activities in the area of BI that include this population.

   Because of the seond-hand nature of the data collected relative to inservice topics and others in need of inservice on these topics, it would be presumptous to suggest

the content of inservice for such other populations, although there were some consistent findings on the direction that BI professionals felt such inservice should take. For this information, the reader is referred back to Section I - Part C, Survey Results and Analyses. For truly accurate data, each of the other populations would have to be directly surveyed on their own felt needs in terms of inservice. Suffice to say, the degree to which one feels that the fulfillment of the BI professionals' perceptions relative to others' inservice needs will, in fact, enhance the quality of service to BI children and youth, will have a direct bearing on whether the data provided herein on this variable have relevance for future inservice plans.

2. The above discussion has relevance also as one examines the very specific data related to populations such as counselors/psychologists in need of inservices on topics such as identification and counseling and principals in need of inservice on discipline. Because of the highly predictable nature of the data, it is questionable whether they add anything new or particularly beneficial for decision makers planning future inservice activities.

Format

1. The incredible consistency of the data on format desirability and effectiveness makes it obvious what formats should be considered when designing future professional development activities for professionals in the field of BI. Therefore it is recommended that inservice activities which

feature salary credit, college credit, visitation to other schools, observation of other teachers, "hands-on" practicum, supervisory support, release time, staff/peer support, conferences/workshops, and problem-solving sessions be given highest priority. Of course, these formats must be interpreted within the framework of BI. That is, for example, the format of teacher visitation would need to be implemented within the context of classes for the behaviorally impaired.

2. One very specific recommendation emerges in relation to college coursework/college credit. This format was one of two (the other being salary credit) which ranked highest on the criteria of desirability and effectiveness. Interestingly, the data also indicated that almost half (47%) of the respondents had not completed college coursework within the last 12 months. Given this information and the fact that a substantial proportion of the professionals in BI do not hold endorsement in BI, it is apparent that the college credit option must be more highly incorporated into future inservice plans.
3. Finally, caution must be taken with regard to the use of formats such as regional study groups, brown bag sessions, panel discussions, early bird sessions, and weekend offerings. Clearly these formats were both less desirable and less effective in the minds of the respondents. Inservice planners would be wise to avoid these options based on the consistency of the data. Fortunately the variety of options

available on the positive end of the continuum of desirability and effectiveness should not work any undo hardship on those individuals designing inservice with an eye to a variety of formats.

There are, in addition to the above recommendations, some suggestions relative to the process of the data collection that might be of assistance. While these are not recommendations in the sense of being derived from the data, they are some suggestions that result from having worked with these data and from being familiar with its "strengths and weaknesses." These suggestions are offered for consideration to assist in any future survey efforts of this nature whether they be specific to BI or for some other categorical area. These suggestions fall into three broad groups.

1. It would appear to be appropriate to tap principals and special education directors as a follow-up effort of this survey. One impetus for this suggestion is the fact that this group of persons was sometimes an obvious subset of the data collected on this instrument. That is, for some items, differences that appeared across groups were apparently because the subgroup of principals/administrators responded differently than did BI teachers or resource teachers. A second thought which argues for a similar survey of this population is that of a validation of the teachers' perceptions. As decision makers in such matters as inservice offerings, it is important to know how they perceive the content and format issues. It might be suggested that this population be sent the data results of this survey and be

asked to respond in terms of whether or not these topics, intensities and formats are being offered within their buildings/districts.

2. Another set of suggestions centers around the survey instrument itself. There is a large amount of data collected on this survey. This is typical of "one-time" efforts since there is the need to gather a variety of data. However, after working with the data, it would appear that some changes could be made on the instrument that would shorten and/or simplify it without endangering, in any way, the quality of data collected for the purpose of planning in-service. For example, in Section I, Part B, it appears equally as feasible to reduce the responses to two options: (a) single contacts and (b) multiple contacts. If each of these were defined in terms of the options that currently exist it would be possible to gather the conceptual information but have a simple 1 or 2 response. On Part B of that same section, the current data would indicate that choices six and seven could be combined or even dropped altogether. Also choice nine (none) was seldom used. Instead, it appears, that persons simply left the item blank and thus registered as "no responses."

   Finally, in Section III there is a great deal of data that could be excluded. It is interesting information, but given the need to streamline the instrument, it can be omitted without damaging the inservice planning intent of the survey. Those items that could be removed include the ones on

professional growth (eight and nine), support (ten), plans to remain in BI and/or education (twelve and thirteen) and job enjoyment/frustration (fourteen, fifteen, and sixteen).

3. A final suggestion concerns the process which leads to the development of such an instrument. The process utilized in this case included input from BI teachers, BI supervisors, state education agency personnel, institutions of higher education personnel, mental health personnel and people from other public agencies as well as public schools. This range of people is benificial in such a task and it is felt that the survey benefitted as a result of their input. Future efforts would be wise to include such a range of people. Inclusion of BI teachers was particularly useful.

REFERENCES

Goldstein, H. Social Learning Curriculum. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1975.

Grosenick, J.K. & Huntze, S.L. National Needs Analysis in Behavior Disorders: Severe Behavior Disorders. University of Missouri-Columbia, July, 1980a.

Grosenick, J.K. & Huntze, S.L. National Needs Analysis in Behavior Disorders: Adolescent Behavior Disorders. University of Missouri-Columbia, October, 1980b.

Huntze, S.L. & Grosenick, J.K. National Needs Analysis in Behavior Disorders: Human Resource Issues. University of Missouri-Columbia, September, 1980.

McKenzie, H.S. Special education and consulting teachers. In Clark, F., Evans, D., & Hammelynk, L. (Eds.), Implementing Behavioral Programs for Schools. Champaign, IL: Research Press, 1972, 103-125.

Stephen, T.M., Hartman, A.C., & Lucas, V.H. Teaching Children Basic Skills: A Curriculum Handbook. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1978.

Tharp, R.G. The triadic model of consultation: Current considerations. In Parker, C. (Ed). Psychological Consultation: Helping Teachers Meet Special Needs. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1975, 135-151.

APPENDIX A

Professional Development Needs Survey
for Serving
Behaviorally Impaired Students.

When completed return to: 204 Barkley Memorial Center, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68583-0775

Please include additional comments on seperate sheets if you wish.

Section 1

Instructions:

Please rate each content/skill area listed below with regard to:

A. Need you have for assistance in this area from 1 = low priority (no need) to 5 = highest priority (extremely high need). You may use any number more than once.
B. Amount of assistance in this area which would be most beneficial to you. Choose from these options, use only one for each.

1 = one time contact with assistance;
2 = one time contact with additional assistance upon request;
3 = several contacts over one to two months;
4 = multiple contacts over the school year;
5 = multiple contacts over more than one school year.

C. Others needing assistance--In addition to yourself list the one other group of persons who could potentially benefit most from assistance in this area. Choose one from the list.

1 = other special education teachers
2 = principal
3 = supervisor/spec. ed. director
4 = counselor/psychologists/other support personnel
5 = regular classroom teacher
6 = aides/paraprofessionals
7 = secretary/custodian/nonprofessional
8 = other (specify) _____
9 = none

Content/Skill	A. Need	B. Amount of assistance	C. Others in need of assistance
Example: Making bulletin board.	2	1	1
1. Identification (screening, referral and evaluation)	___	___	___
2. Problem solving strategies in education.	___	___	___
3. Program entry/exit decisions	___	___	___
4. Techniques for motivating/rewarding students.	___	___	___
5. Individual Education Program (IEPs) Development	___	___	___
6. Creativity/originality in teaching.	___	___	___
7. Parent involvement	___	___	___
8. Curriculum content/materials in:			
a. Math/science	___	___	___
b. Language/reading	___	___	___
c. Social studies	___	___	___
d. Vocational preparation/ career education	___	___	___
e. Physical education	___	___	___
f. Music, art, etc.	___	___	___
g. Social skills/affective education	___	___	___
9. Assertiveness--ability for a teacher to establish authority and leadership tempered with understanding.	___	___	___

	A. Desirability	B. Effectiveness
5. "Hands on" practicum	____	____
6. Video tapes and critique	____	____
7. Conferences and Workshops	____	____
8. Inservice with (salary) credit	____	____
9. College credit	____	____
10. Teacher/children exchanges	____	____
11. Retreats/personal revitalization centers	____	____
12. Panel discussions	____	____
13. Summer seminars	____	____
14. Regional study groups	____	____
15. Release time	____	____
16. Problem solving sessions	____	____
17. Staff & peer support systems	____	____
18. Supervisory support	____	____
19. Teacher consultants	____	____
20. "Make and take" sessions	____	____
21. Permanent floating substitutes	____	____
22. Brown bag sessions	____	____
23. Early bird sessions	____	____
24. Short term sabbaticals	____	____
25. Personal contracts for improvement	____	____

Section 3

1. Circle the number of the one which best describes your role:

   1 teacher of behaviorally impaired
   2 other special education teacher
   3 principal
   4 director of special education
   5 other (specify) _____

2. Which of the following best describes your endorsement status to teach behaviorally impaired students?

   1. Hold BI endorsement
   2. Hold provisional BI endorsement
   3. Not endorsed

3. Circle the number of the one which best describes the type of agency in which you work:

   1 public school
   2 other public agency
   3 private agency
   4 other (specify) _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	A. Need	B. Amount of assistance	C. Others in need of assistance
10. Individual behavior management strategies (e.g., positive reinforcement, time-out, contracts, etc.)	___	___	___
11. Individual counseling strategies (e.g., reality therapy, life space interviews, transactional analysis, etc.)	___	___	___
12. Group management/classroom management strategies (e.g., classroom meetings, cooperative learning, grouping of students, etc.)	___	___	___
13. Environmental management (e.g., seating arrangements, scheduling, task analysis & organization, etc.)	___	___	___
14. Strategies for coping with job related stress.	___	___	___
15. Consultation/collaboration with other educators.	___	___	___
16. Flexibility/adaptability/patience in teaching.	___	___	___
17. Discipline, suspension and expulsion.	___	___	___
18. Strong self concept and confidence as a teacher.	___	___	___
19. Integrating/mainstreaming students	___	___	___
20. Ability to sense and use humor in school situations.	___	___	___
21. Roles and functions of various agencies & programs (e.g., corrections, welfare, mental health, etc.)	___	___	___
22. Being "street wise"--knowledge of students environments and culture.	___	___	___
23. Accessing residential treatment alternatives.	___	___	___
24. Empathy/warmth/enjoyment in relationships with students.	___	___	___
25. Other (specify) _____	___	___	___

Section 2

A variety of potential typed formats for continued professional development of teachers might be available. Please rate each of the following options regarding their desirability and potential effectiveness for your professional development.

Please rate on a scale of 1 = lowest to 5 = highest each of the following activities for professional growth regarding their:

A. desirability as a format for your participation in professional growth.

B. effectiveness in general as a format for your professional growth.

Type of Format	A. Desirability	B. Effectiveness
Example: Five year sabbatical to Tahiti	5	1
1. Observations of other teachers	___	___
2. Visitations to other schools	___	___
3. Demonstrations/simulations	___	___
4. Weekend offerings		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. Approximately how many inservice presentations/programs did you attend in the last 12 months? ____

5. Of the inservice presentations or courses you participated in, how many focused specifically on behavior problem students? ____

6. Have you been satisfied with most inservice programs you have attended? Circle your answer.

   1. yes 2. no Why or why not?

7. How many college/university courses (in any subjects) did you complete in the last 12 months?

   _____ courses

8. Do you have a professional growth plan in mind for your own professional development over the next year (or more)? Circle your answer.

   1. yes 2. no Briefly explain if possible:

9. Do you feel that you have grown as a professional (increased knowledge and/or skills) in the last year? Circle your answer.

   1. yes 2. no

   If yes, what enabled that growth?

   If not, what prevented that growth?

10. From whom do you derive the most support regarding your job? (Rank each item below from 1 = Very little support to 9 = Most support.)

1. other special education teachers	____	6. non-handicapped students	____
2. classroom teachers	____	7. psychologists, consultants, and other support staff	____
3. family members	____	8. building administrator, principal	____
4. individual friends	____	9. special education directors	____
5. handicapped students	____	10. other (specify) _____	____

11. How long have you been in a position where you are serving Behaviorally Impaired students?

    1. the current school year only--less than one full year
    2. the current school year plus one previous year
    3. the current school year plus two previous years
    4. the current school year plus three previous years
    5. the current school year plus four or more previous years

12. How long do you expect to continue in a position where you are serving Behaviorally Impaired students?

    1. At least until end of current contract year
    2. At least until end of next school year
    3. At least 2-5 more school years
    4. At least 6 or more school years
    5. Indefinitely
    6. Undecided

13. How long do you expect to continue in some education related position (e.g., teacher, administrator, higher education, etc.)? Circle one.

    1. At least until end of current contract year
    2. At least until end of next school year
    3. At least 2-5 more school years
    4. At least 6 or more school years
    5. Indefinitely
    6. Undecided

14. List no more than three aspects of your job that you enjoy the most.

    1. 2. 3.

15. List no more than three aspects of your job that you enjoy the least.

    1. 2. 3.

16. List no more than three of the greatest causes of stress or frustration in your current job.

    1. 2. 3.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE